

REMARKS

Claims 1, 5, 6, 9, 10 and 17-32 are pending in the current application. Claims 1, 5, 9, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 27, 28, 30 and 31 are currently amended.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1, 5-6 and 9-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Examiner asserts the term “computer readable medium” is not described in Applicants’ specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one of ordinary skill in the relevant art that Applicants, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed subject matter. Applicants direct the Examiner’s attention to paragraph [0020] of Applicants’ originally filed specification which states the following:

A high-density optical disk, **for example, a Blu-Ray ROM (BD-ROM), BD-RE, etc.** in accordance with the invention may have a file or data structure for managing reproduction of video and audio data as shown in FIG. 1. Some aspects of the data structure according to the present invention shown in FIG. 1 are the same as the well-known BD-RE standard, as such these aspects will not be described in great detail.
(emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully submit, paragraph [0020] of Applicants’ originally filed specification clearly discloses a high-density optical disk having a file or data structure for managing reproduction of video and audio data. Further, paragraph [0020] clearly lists as examples of such a disk, Blu-Ray ROM and RE disks. It is well known in the art that Blu-Ray ROM and RE disks **are computer-readable media**. Accordingly, it is

clear that, in light of at least paragraph [0020] of Applicant's originally filed specification, one of ordinary skill in the art would conclude that Applicants had possession of the "computer readable medium" recited in claims 1, 5-6, and 9-10 at the time the application was filed. Consequently, claims 1, 5-6, and 9-10 meet the written description requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the rejection of claims 1, 5-6, and 9-10 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 5-6, 9-10 and 17-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Murase et al. (US 6,400,893, hereinafter "Murase").

First, claim 1 recites: "a playlist area storing a playlist file, the playlist file including at least one playitem indicating an in-point and out-point of the clip stream file to reproduce at least one still image". Murase does not appear to teach a playitem as is recited in claim 1.

Next, Applicants note the Examiner asserts col. 6, lines 37-41 of Murase teach a type indicator indicating whether the **video data** is for at least one still image. However, Murase does not appear to teach a type indicator relating to a clip information file, itself. Accordingly, Murase fails to teach a type indicator "indicating that **the clip information file** is related to managing the still image" (emphasis added) as amended claim 1 requires. Likewise, Applicants note the Examiner asserts col. 19, lines 50-52 teach a length indicator indicating a length of an information file. Col. 19, lines 50-52 of Murase teach a video part size V_PART_SZ which is a **data size of the video part of a still picture VOB**. However, Murase does not appear to teach a length indicator relating to a clip information file, itself. Accordingly, Murase fails to

teach “a length indicator indicating a size of ***the clip information file*** subsequent to the length indicator” (emphasis added) as amended claim 1 requires.

For at least these reasons, Murase fails to teach each of the elements in claim 1, or any claims depending from claim 1, as is required to support a rejection under §102.

Further, claims 17-20 have been amended and contain limitations at least somewhat similar to those of claim 1. Consequently, at least in view of the similarity of claims 1 and claims 17-20, Murase fails to teach each of the elements in any of claims 17-20, or claims depending from any of claims 17-20, as is required to support a rejection under §102.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1, 5-6, 9-10 and 17-32 under 35 U.S.C. §102 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the objections and rejections and allowance of each of claims 1, 5, 6, 9, 10 and 17-32 in connection with the present application is earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Gary D. Yacura at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By



Gary D. Yacura, Reg. No. 35,416

P.O. Box 8910
Reston, Virginia 20195
(703) 668-8000

JHA
GDY/JHA: tlt